UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISON

CARL WILLIAMS AND HASSAN ALEEM et al Creditors/Objectors,

٧

In re: City OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN AND EMERGENCY MANAGER KEVYN D. ORR

Debtors/City of Detroit

Chapter 9
Case No. 13-53846
Judge Steven W Rhodes

Case No. 14-cv-10434 Hon. Bernard A. Freidman Magistrate Paul J. Komives

OBJECTION TO THE FILING OF REDLINED VERSION OF EIGHT AMENDED PLAN FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF DEBTS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT AND THE CONFIRMATION FILED OCTOBER 31, 2014

We/I OBJECT TO THE REDLINED VERISON OF THE EIGHTH AMENDED PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE DEBTS OF THE CITY OF DETRIOIT AND CONFIRMATION OF THE PLAN, THERE WAS NO NOTICE, IT WAS AFTER THE FACT, UNTIMELY, CONTRARY TO THE FACTS, MISREPRESENTATION OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE AND RULES AND HAS NOT BEEN PRESENT ED AND CONDUCED IN A GOOD FAITH MANNER.

We/I object to the filing of redlined version of the Eighth Amended

Plan of Adjustment for the debts of the city of Detroit and confirmation of any

Plan stemming from or connected to this plan of Adjustment and show

following:

1

- 1) We object because the opposing party has not replied to any of our objections and they are admitted when not denied and assumed to be true.
- 2) We object to the opposing party not responding to any of our object-tions and the court cannot supply the deficiency of the opposing party failure to respond or their lack of talents and rule on opposing party behalf when they never asked for confirmation, objected to a confirmation, briefed for a confirmation, or argued for confirmation, and never responded Percy Harris Jr. v City of Detroit Court of Appeals 257345(2003); Tringali v Lal Michigan 164 App 299, 300-301 (1987); The court has stated the court cannot grant relief on an issue neither brief nor argued. Celotex v Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-326 (1985) Anderson v Liberty Lobby, Inc 477 U.S. 242,106 S.Ct 2505, 2511, 91 L.ED.2d.
- 3) The opposing party (the City of Detroit) have not answer any of our objections and the court has shown material prejudice and bias by prosecuting the case for the opposing side the debtor, the city of Detroit. The court action is one of the prosecutor and the decision maker which has been prohibited by the Supreme Court years ago in Wong Yang Sung v McGrath 339 U.S. 33, 41 (1949); The purpose to curtail and change the practice of embodying in one person or agency the duties of prosecutor and judge.

4) The City of Detroit came come up with a plan at any time but once the city come up with a plan that become the plan 11 USC 946

I/We hereby certify that the statements made herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, under penalty of perjury and contempt of Court under the laws of the United States of America.

Alem

Carl Williams

10112 Somerset

Detroit, Michigan 48224

313 521-5012

Hassan Aleem

2440 Taylor

Detroit, Michigan 48206

313 205-4353

Lateina Henry	
Name 5/0 Rowheides	name
Address 1 . M. Ch. 78200	Address
City State & Zip	City, State & Zip code
Name	name
Address	Address
City State & Zip	City, State & Zip code
Name	name
Address	Address
City State & Zip	City, State & Zip code
Name	name
Address	Address
City State & Zip	City, State & Zip code
Name	name
Address	Address
City State & Zip	City, State & Zip code

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISON

CARL WILLIAMS AND HASSAN ALEEM Creditors/Objectors,

Creditors/Objectors,	
V	
In re: City OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN	Chapter 9 Case No. 13-53846
AND EMERGENCY MANAGER	Judge Steven W Rhodes
KEVYN D. ORR	, augo stoven iv imoued
Debtor/City of Detroit	Case No. 14-cv-10434
	Hon. Bernard A. Freidman
	Magistrate Paul J. Komives

Emergency Manager Kenyn Orr Coleman A Young Municipal Center 2 Woodward 11th floor Detroit, Michigan 48226

I/We hereby certify that the statements made herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, under penalty of perjury and contempt of Court under the laws of the United States of America.

Sign Cal Bullians

Dated November / 2014